



Guidelines for Experts on Quality Assessment

KA107 Applications

Version of 17/02/2015

Annex 2.E Mobility between programme and partner countries in the field of higher education

N.B.: Applications in the field of Higher Education (HE) within Programme Countries are not subject to quality assessment, as this is undertaken at the level of the accreditation for an Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE).

Mobility applications in the field of Higher Education between Programme and Partner Countries will be assessed against the award criteria mentioned in the table below.

The expert will first assess the eligibility of the mobility flows. In addition to the general criteria (as outlined in the Programme Guide), and only where the National Agency budget envelope is below 60,000 EUR, a National Agency may choose to limit demand by adding one or more of the following **secondary criteria** listed in the Programme Guide:

- a. The degree level (for example limiting applications to one or two cycles only – Bachelor, Master or PhD);
- b. Privileging only staff or student mobility;
- c. Limiting the duration of mobility periods.

If the application concerns a Partner Country for which the National Agency has set secondary criteria, the experts will first check that the application respects all the secondary criteria published by the National Agency and exclude those mobility flows which fall outside the secondary criteria. The implementation of these secondary criteria must be explained in detail by the National Agency during the expert briefing session.

The expert will also take into account whether the National Agency has decided to make available **funds from Heading 1 budget** in order to fund outgoing, short cycle, first and second cycle students to higher education institutions from DCI Partner Countries (these flows would not be eligible if heading 1 budget is not used).

The expert will undertake a single assessment per Partner Country answering the 4 quality questions relating to all intended mobilities with that particular country. Each application is likely to request mobility support for a number of different Partner Countries. The intended mobility for a given Partner Country may vary in terms of the number of flows requested (students at different study cycles or staff involved in teaching or training; incoming and/or outgoing).

According to the assessment of the quality criteria, the expert may recommend to the National Agency to select only mobilities with certain Partner Countries (e.g. retention of the mobility with Albania but rejection of the mobility involving Australia), or, only some mobility flows within a given Partner Country (e.g. retention of the incoming first cycle students from Albania but rejection of the outgoing staff to Albania).

Example

University X in Finland envisages mobility with a number of Albanian universities based on previous experience with these partners. These mobilities foresee incoming Albanian student mobility for first and second cycle and outgoing Finnish staff mobility for teaching and training. The experts may give a range of advice to the Finnish NA such as:

- Recommend retention of all the mobility flows requested.

- Recommend retention of only certain mobility flows (e.g. only incoming student first cycle and outgoing staff teaching and training).
- Recommend reduction of some or all mobility flows (e.g. recommend retention of only X% of incoming student first cycle and only Y% second cycle; etc.)
- Recommend rejection of all the mobility flows.

The rejection of the mobilities with Albania, based on the expert evaluation of the four award criteria, is without prejudice to the mobilities involving other Partner Countries in the same application from University X. The experts may decide that the justifications given by University X for the Albanian mobilities are not convincing, but the justifications provided for mobilities with China, Brazil or South Africa are very good.

Award Criteria

	Elements of analysis under award criteria	Interpretation of award criteria for HE between Programme and Partner Countries
Relevance of the strategy (maximum 30 points)	The extent to which the planned mobility is relevant to the internationalisation strategy of the higher education institutions involved (both in the Programme and in the Partner Country) and the rationale for choosing staff and/or student mobility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The evaluator should assess how the chosen Partner Country fits the applicant's internationalisation strategy. b. The evaluator should assess to what extent the planned mobility reinforces the capacities and international scope of the participant organisations. Applicants should be specific about which Partner Country Higher Education Institution(s) they will work with and demonstrate how mobility fits the internationalisation strategy of these partner organisation(s). c. The evaluator should assess the explanations given for the choice of requested incoming and outgoing mobility flows of staff (training or teaching) and/or students (different cycles) with respect to the internationalisation strategies of the HEIs involved.
Quality of the cooperation arrangements (maximum 30 points)	The extent to which the applicant organisation has previous experience of similar projects with higher education institutions in the Partner Country and the clarity of the description of responsibilities, roles and tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The evaluator should assess the planned cooperation arrangements. A previous mobility project with the chosen Partner Country should be considered an advantage, regardless of whether this was supported by the EU (e.g. Erasmus Mundus) or other funds. b. The existence of previous or running cooperation agreements between the applicant HEI and the HEI in the partner

	between partners.	country setting out respective roles and tasks is also an advantage.
<p>Quality of the activity design and implementation (maximum 20 points)</p>	<p>The completeness and quality of arrangements for the selection of participants, the support provided to them and the recognition of their mobility period (in particular in the Partner country).</p>	<p>The evaluator will assess the planned practical implementation of the mobilities, in particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the mobilities (preparation, implementation of mobility activities and follow-up). The appropriateness of measures for selecting participants. Special attention should be given by the expert to measures planned by the applicant and its partner organisation(s) for ensuring equal opportunities, social equity and promoting participation of disadvantaged persons. The information and support provided prior to the mobility, e.g. accommodation services, language training, learning/mobility agreements and administrative support (insurance, visa, etc.). The mechanisms envisaged for recognition of student learning outcomes (e.g. ECTS or other mechanisms). The way in which the HEIs will recognise and reward the outcomes of outgoing staff mobility.
<p>Impact and dissemination (maximum 20 points)</p>	<p>The potential impact of the mobility on participants, beneficiaries and partner organisations at local, regional and national levels, as well as the quality of measures aimed at disseminating the results of the at faculty and institution level (and beyond, where applicable), in both the Programme and Partner Countries.</p>	<p>The evaluator will assess the potential impact and dissemination of the planned mobility in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The potential impact of the mobility on individuals and HEIs, at local, regional and national level during and after the project lifetime. How the results of the mobility will be disseminated at faculty and institution level, and beyond where applicable, in both the Programme and Partner Countries. The strategy for monitoring and evaluating the outcomes of the mobility.